

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 13, 1990

1. Call to Order. President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. Alumni Master Teacher Award. Jeff McCarter, Chairman, Master Teacher Selection Committee, briefed the Senate on the Student-Alumni Council's process in the selection of the Master Teacher.

Students send nominations to the Alumni Center in February. Each nominee is screened to determine eligibility: Nominee must not be a current Alumni Professor or former Master Teacher recipient; must have served on the faculty for the last three academic years; and have spent 60% of the workload teaching academic courses. Selection of the Master Teacher is made in March. Formal announcement and presentation of the plaque is made at Commencement in May.

3. Clemson Leadership Awareness Seminars for Students (C.L.A.S.S.). Chip Dukes said C.L.A.S.S. is a new program instituted this semester to develop leadership abilities of students. The President of the University, professors, deans, associate vice presidents, and community leaders will conduct seminars on time management, strategic planning, parliamentary procedures, and professionalism. Faculty are asked to encourage students to participate. Each student completing the seminars receives an official transcript stating the student has been trained in the specified areas.

4. Approval of Minutes. The minutes of the meetings of the General Faculty on December 20, 1989; the Faculty Senate on January 9, 1990; and the Called meeting of Faculty Senate on January 25, 1990, were approved as distributed.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate Committees

Policy Committee. Senator Luedeman presented the report of the Policy Committee (Attachment A). He called attention to "Procedures for Distribution of Faculty Development

Funds," included with the Policy Committee Report. The report will be considered under old business.

Senator Luedeman reported a letter from Professor Jerry Trapnell, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Organization of Academic Department Heads, responding to the Senate Resolution on Recommended Procedures in the Evaluation of Department Heads. Dr. Trapnell interprets the limited number of responses from members of the Organization of Academic Department Heads to mean that the resolution is acceptable to most department heads.

Research Committee. Senator Graham, reporting for Chairman Young, called attention to the committee report (Attachment B) and stated the items listed concerning modifications of the Policy on Research Ethics would be considered under old business.

Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Kosinski called attention to the Report of the Scholastic Policies Committee (Attachment C).

Welfare Committee. Senator Kennedy presented the Report of the Welfare Committee (Attachment D).

b. University Commissions and Committees

Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Senator Kosinski reported the Commission's activities. The Commission made a thorough study of a proposal from the Chemistry Department for an extended section of Chemistry 101. The proposal would allow students who are not making satisfactory grades in Chemistry 101 to drop the regular course and enter a special course with the same topics spread over two semesters. The commission voted to deny the request.

The Commission on Undergraduate Studies suggested other ways to solve the problem of Chemistry 101, i.e., a remedial course, a short summer training session, or a personalized system of instruction. The Chemistry Department, however, is unwilling to invest the manpower for those types of approaches.

The Commission considered time limits on retroactive grade changes. The Commission passed a resolution stating that to correct an erroneous grade, the student must submit a request within 120 days of the time the grade report was issued.

George Carter reported to the Commission on the Clemson Scholars. This academic year 151 Clemson Scholars entered Clemson, of which 98 were minorities. At the end of the fall semester, 59 of the 151 had less than 2.5 GPR and, therefore, were unable to continue with their scholarships.

Calling attention to Attachment B in the President's Report (Proposal to Council of Deans Concerning Control of Excessive Registration), Senator Kosinski stated that Mr. Stan Smith recommended restricting the number of hours for which a student could pre-register. The Commission did not approve the proposal.

Faculty Manual Committee. Senator Murr reported he has available a valid copy of the Faculty Manual in a Macintosh format. Senator Murr and Professor Martin Jacobi are revising the Manual to delete sexist language. It is expected the Faculty Manual Committee will report to the Senate early next term.

6. President's Report. President Halfacre called attention to his report (Attachment E). He urged Senators to make nominations to members of the Executive/Advisory Committee regarding Faculty Senate officers for 1990-91. He also encouraged Senators to make suggestions regarding the Senate's annual party to any of the Standing Committee Chairs, who are serving as the committee for the event.

7. Old Business

a. Policy on Research Ethics. It was moved and seconded that the Policy on Research Ethics, tabled at the meeting of Faculty Senate on January 9, 1990, be taken from the Table.

Senator Graham called attention to the Report of the Research Committee dated February 1990, pointing out that Items 1 through 8 are the committee's attempt to address the Senate's objections at the last meeting as well as some suggestions from Dr. Jonathan Black, Professor Bioengineering, and University Attorney Ben Anderson.

Senator Graham moved withdrawal of the motion and submitted the Policy on Research Ethics, Proposed Revisions, February 1990, as a substitute motion. Senator Louderback seconded. The Senate unanimously approved consideration of the substitute motion.

The Policy on Research Ethics, Proposed Revisions, February 1990 (FS90-2-3 P) (Attachment F), was approved unanimously.

b. Procedures for Distribution of Faculty Development Funds. On behalf of the Policy Committee, Senator Luedeman moved acceptance of the procedures. Discussion followed with regards to designating Faculty Development Funds as a line item in the budget and proper uses of the funds. Senator Luedeman accepted a friendly amendment to change the title of the report to "Guidelines for Distribution of Faculty Development Funds."

Senator McGuire expressed a desire to give faculty members the option of designating the money. Senator LeBlanc moved to amend the last two sentences in the report by adding the phrase, "except by approval of the individual Faculty member." The motion was seconded.

The motion to amend the fourth paragraph in the report to read, "The Faculty Development Funds are not to be used to increase the department's travel budget except with the approval of the individual faculty member," was approved unanimously.

The motion to amend the fifth paragraph in the report to read, "The Faculty Development Funds are not to be used to enhance departmental collections or other department-wide activities, except with the approval of the individual faculty member," was approved unanimously.

The question was called. The call for the question was seconded and passed. The Report by the Policy Committee on Procedures for Distribution of Faculty Development Funds as amended (FS90-2-2 P) (Attachment G) was approved.

c. Resolution on Faculty Development Funds. On behalf of the Policy Committee, Senator Luedeman moved acceptance of the Resolution on Faculty Development Funds with the addition of the phrase, "except with the approval of the individual faculty member." The amendment was approved unanimously.

The Resolution on Faculty Development Funds as amended (FS90-2-1 P) (Attachment H) carried.

d. Report on contributions to the Centennial Professorship. President Halfacre, reporting for Senator Dunn, said the fund for the Centennial Professorship has \$67,703.

e. Election of replacement for Professor Henry Pate on the Parking and Traffic Committee. Senator Samuel T. Ingram was nominated. The nomination was seconded. Senator Ingram was unanimously elected to the Parking and Traffic Committee.

8. New Business.

a. Procedures for the Evaluation of Deans at Clemson University. Senator Luedeman, Chair of the Policy Committee, moved acceptance of the procedures (Attachment I).

In view of responses from the Organization of Academic Department Heads and Dean Waller, Senator Luedeman moved to delete "and the Board of Trustees" from Item 1 and Item 5 and to further amend Item 5 to read, "The Provost, after consulting with additional persons whom he chooses (associate deans, other department heads, etc.) shall make an evaluation and forward it with the group findings to the President. The Provost's evaluation will also be shared with the Dean. A general and summary report of the Provost's evaluation shall be sent to all faculty members and staff of the relevant college."

Senator Gaddis moved to delete the last sentence in Item 5. The motion was seconded and approved.

Senator Luedeman summarized comments by Dean Waller (Attachment J) and the Organization of Academic Department Heads (Attachment K).

President Halfacre reported concerns of the Council of Academic Deans, i.e., the lack of other deans in the review process, reporting to the Board of Trustees, the dissemination of the report, and classified staff involved in the review of academicians. The Council also has concerns about the aspect of separate findings going forward.

Senator Gaddis pointed out an inconsistency in the frequency of evaluation. Item 1 in the report indicates "The Deans...shall be evaluated every five years..."; Item 2 states "During the Dean's fifth year of administrative service..."

Senator LeBlanc moved to delete "During the Dean's fifth year of administrative service" in Item 2. Senator Luedeman accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

Senator Graham asked how the evaluation would apply in the College of Agricultural Sciences, which has a Vice Provost and a number of deans. Discussion followed on the application of the evaluation of non-academic deans.

President Halfacre appointed Senator Gaddis Parliamentarian for the remainder of the meeting after the departure of Senator Coulter.

Senator Gaddis moved that the report be tabled for further study. Senator Graham seconded. The motion passed.

b. Election of members to Grievance Board. President Halfacre reported three vacancies on the Grievance Board. He presented two nominations from the Executive/Advisory Committee for the Grievance Board to serve through 1991: Professor Robert Hogan and Professor Gerald Waddle. President Halfacre called for additional nominations from the floor. There were none.

Senator Milstead moved that Professor Hogan and Professor Waddle be elected to the Grievance Board. The motion was seconded. Professor Hogan and Professor Waddle were unanimously elected to serve on the Grievance Board through 1991.

c. Nominations for Grievance Counselors. President Halfacre reported the following nominations from the Executive/Advisory Committee: Professors John Huffman, Lewis Bryan, MaryAnn Reichenbach, and Robert Snelshire. President Halfacre called for additional nominations. There were none. He said the Executive/Advisory Committee will elect three Grievance Counselors at the meeting on March 1.

9. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Kenneth R. Murr
Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary

Margaret K. Cannon
Margaret K. Cannon, Staff Secretary

Members absent: G. Christenbury, A. Dunn, J. Hammond, J. Harris, P. Loge, A. Madison, R. Marion, J. Ryan, R. Schalkoff, W. Stringer, T. Tisue, R. Young.

Policy Committee Report January, 1990

The Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate met on January 23, 1990 and discussed the following items:

1. Procedures for the Evaluation of Academic Deans at Clemson University. The Committee approved this draft of the Procedures and will present them to the Senate for approval.
2. Faculty Development Funds: The Committee approved a list of proper uses of the Faculty Development Funds. The Committee also approved a resolution asking the administration to raise faculty development funds to \$150 per faculty member and to list these funds as line items in each college and department budget.
3. Request from the Council of Academic Deans to place an administrator on the Grievance Board by eliminating one panel member and replacing that member with an administrator: The Committee discussed this request. Since the original purpose of the Grievance Board was to have a grievance heard by a jury of the griever's peers, and since the board's findings are only advice to the Provost, a member of the administration, and since input from the appropriate administrator is heard by the grievance board, and since the concerned administrators have usually availed themselves of the opportunity of placing their input before the Provost outside of the Grievance Board, the Committee unanimously recommended that this request be denied and that the President of the Faculty Senate inform the Council of Academic Deans that their request was considered and denied.

2/06/90

John Luedeman, Chair

RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT February, 1990

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met at 1:00 pm, February 2, 1990 in Room 104 McAdams Hall. Attendees were Doyce Graham, Eldon Zehr, Joe Hammond, Bill Stringer, John Ryan, Russ Marion and Roy Young.

The Committee reviewed comments received from the floor of the Faculty Senate, University attorney Ben Anderson and Dr. Jonathan Black, Hunter Professor of Bioengineering, concerning modifications of the Policy on Research Ethics. After careful deliberation, the Committee proposes the following modifications:

1. Insert the word "**calendar**" immediately before the word "days" throughout the policy to distinguish from working days and to be consistent with other policies in the Faculty Manual.
2. In section II, DEFINITIONS, under Inquiry, first sentence, delete the adjective "**faculty**" so that it reads: **Expeditious gathering and review of information to determine if an investigation is warranted.** This removes any implication that the policy applies only to faculty and broadens its application to all persons who may be participants in research activities.
3. In section III, PROCEDURES, under Investigation, first paragraph, after "...five faculty members to conduct a full investigation." add **"Within the same 20 calendar days, the Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate President will notify the accused of the impending investigation and the nature of the allegations."** This assures notification of the accused.
4. In section III, PROCEDURES, under Investigation, second paragraph, add after "...allow for all parties to present their views..." **"separately (without the presence of the other parties) to the Committee."** This assures that the investigation does not constitute an adversary hearing.
5. In section III, PROCEDURES, under Investigation, fourth paragraph, add after the first sentence the following: **"Any recommendation from the Committee of Investigation that may constitute disciplinary action against a faculty member will be referred by the Provost to the appropriate dean, or other administrator as determined by the Provost. The dean or administrator will decide appropriate action within 15 calendar days."** This accommodates for situations when the "appropriate dean" may not be intuitively apparent.
6. In section III, PROCEDURES, under Investigation add a final paragraph as follows: **If disciplinary action taken against a faculty member constitutes a grievable action under either Faculty Grievance Procedure I or Faculty Grievance Procedure II, the faculty member may file a grievance in accordance with the appropriate procedure.** This assures compatibility of the Policy with standing Grievance Procedures.

7. In section III, PROCEDURES, under Guiding Principles, second paragraph, modify to read as follows: Assure the respondent a fair hearing and access to reports. This assures that the respondent is privy to reports.
8. In section III, PROCEDURES, under Guiding Principles, sixth paragraph delete **"If possible criminal violations are indicated, all agencies will be notified within 24 hours."** Any implication of criminal violations by an internal university committee might open the University to actions for damages associated with libel.

The Research Committee requests that the Policy on Research Ethics be appropriately incorporated into the Faculty Manual at the earliest possible date.

Roy Young, Chair

Scholastic Policies Committee Report of the February Meeting

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on January 30. The main items discussed were GS 800 (a course without a sponsoring department), admissions exceptions for scholarship athletes, and Stan Smith's suggestions on our resolution to move the first drop date to before the last day to add a course.

Dr. Farrell Brown gave the group the history of GS 800, a course in grant proposal preparation which was taught in fall of 1989 by Drs. Jay Gogue and Ed Page. The course had no sponsoring department and was approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee without input from any college Curriculum Committee. We all agreed that GS 800 was a worthwhile course, but we believed that the way in which it was approved violated the Faculty Manual. After a short discussion, Dr. Brown agreed to find a sponsoring department for GS 800. After this, Dr. Brown said the course would go through the normal approval process. The committee felt that our concerns had been addressed and we thanked Dr. Brown for his cooperation.

Senator Kosinski informed the group of his conversations with Dr. Jack Stevenson about "Calhoun College H101," another proposed course without a sponsoring department.

We had a lengthy discussion of the procedure by which scholarship athletes are admitted to the University. The past policy has been that scholarship athletes who do not meet normal admissions requirements are referred to the Admissions Exception Committee, but there it seems that they are routinely admitted if they meet NCAA guidelines (SAT of 700 or ACT of 15, plus high school GPR of 2.0 on a set of core courses). We will continue to investigate this issue, and will take it up again at the next meeting.

We briefly discussed Stan Smith's suggestion that the add/drop problem addressed by our recent resolution could be lessened by restricting the number of hours for which a student could preregister.

There still has been no word from the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on our suggested revisions of the General Education Requirements.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman

February 6, 1990

welfare committee report 2/5/90

1. Concern has been expressed about the inequity of allowing a faculty member to obtain sick leave with little difficulty unless the source of sickness is her giving birth. This is under study.
2. A request has been made that the Senate consider attempting to obtain a one-time window for TIAA/CREF applications or to enable faculty members to choose retirement plans other than the South Carolina State Retirement Plan. Persons in the Personnel and Benefits Office explained that the TIAA/CREF exemption for new people was sold on the basis of attracting such people, and that that argument would not apply to persons who have been on the payroll for some time. The argument was also given that TIAA/CREF as a general option would be seen as a threat to the financial solvency of the retirement program.
3. Pre-tax medical deductions were also a concern. Presently, the federal government will allow such deductions only if the entire yearly amount is available at any time during the year. This is contrary to the South Carolina law which forbids any prepayment of salary. One possibility is to hire a co-insurer for such payments and to make the insurance premium payable by the persons wanting the pre-tax deductions. This plan is being studied by the Personnel Office.
4. It appears that there is a campaign against 25 year retirement, based on selected statistics. The source of this campaign is not clear.

William J. Kennedy, Chair

SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT
FEBRUARY 1990

1. The current admissions report was presented to the Academic Council on February 5 by Associate Vice President B. J. Skelton (Attachment A).

2. Mr. Francis M. Canavan, Associate Vice President for Communications and External Relations, described the duties and responsibilities of his office at the meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee on February 1. The function of the office is to facilitate accurate, frequent, productive, and widespread communication with internal and external audiences of Clemson and to facilitate the positive image of the University.

3. Gifts and pledges to the Centennial Professorship totaled \$67,503 as of February 1, 1990.

4. The Selection Committee for the Centennial Professorship has issued a Call for Nominations. Faculty are urged to make nominations for the awarding of the first Clemson University Centennial Professorship.

5. The Executive/Advisory Committee has appointed Senator Eldon Zehr chair of an ad hoc committee to study the University mail service.

6. The Faculty Senate will elect officers for 1990-91 at the meeting on March 13. Senators may submit names by Thursday, March 1, to any member of the Executive/Advisory Committee for consideration. Also nominations may be made from the floor at the Faculty Senate meeting.

7. Attached is a proposal to the Council of Academic Deans concerning control of excessive registration (Attachment B). This was approved by the Council on February 5, 1990.

8. A committee has been appointed by the Executive/Advisory Committee to plan for the Faculty Senate's annual social. Members of the committee include the Chairs of the Senate Standing Committees: Senator John Luedeman (Policy), Senator Roy Young (Research), Senator Robert Kosinski (Scholastic Policies), and Senator W. J. Kennedy (Welfare). The social will be held following the meeting of Faculty Senate on Tuesday, April 10. Suggestions regarding the social may be submitted to any member of the committee.



CLEMSON
UNIVERSITY

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

ADMISSIONS REPORT

February 2, 1990

	<u>1990</u>			<u>1989</u>		
	I/S	O/S	(Total)	I/S	O/S	(Total)
<u>Freshmen:</u>						
Applied	3251	3198	6449			7052
Accepted (Active)	1879	1186	3065	2072	1434	3506
Cancelled	11	16	27			51
Deposits Paid	547	227	774			1121
Denied	337	266	603			425

Freshmen Acceptances by College (Active)

Agriculture	95	39	134	126	34	160
Architecture	73	67	140	105	76	181
Commerce & Industry	333	288	621	352	385	737
Education	193	71	264	199	72	271
Engineering	558	330	888	600	357	957
Forest & Rec. Resources	45	11	56	60	24	84
Liberal Arts	199	210	409	239	275	514
Nursing	61	15	76	48	31	79
Sciences	310	149	459	332	172	504
Undeclared	12	6	18	11	8	19

Transfers:

Applied	335	200	535			445
Accepted (Active)	45	28	73	25	17	42
Cancelled	0	0	0			2
Deposits Paid	6	0	6			4
Denied	6	4	10			10

PROFILE

ENROLLED TRANSFERS

1989 - 90

(Fall and Spring Semesters)

	<u>FALL</u>	<u>SPRING</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
<u>ENROLLED</u>	618	233	851	
<u>SEX</u>				
Female	282	90	372	44%
Male	336	143	479	56%
<u>RESIDENCY STATUS</u>				
In-State	436	156	592	70%
Out-of-state	182	77	259	30%
<u>MOST POPULAR STATES</u>				
South Carolina	431	161	592	
Georgia	21	9	30	
New Jersey	22	7	29	
Florida	21	5	26	
Maryland	18	8	26	
New York	11	5	16	
<u>MOST POPULAR MAJORS</u>				
Freshman Engineering	123	51	174	
Management	39	9	48	
Elementary Education	38	10	48	
Financial Management	40	8	48	
Marketing	32	9	41	
Liberal Arts-Undeclared	25	13	38	
Accounting	24	9	33	

	<u>FALL</u>	<u>SPRING</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
<u>MAJOR (BY COLLEGE)</u>				
Agriculture	37	14	51	6%
Architecture	9	1	10	1%
Education	88	30	118	15%
Engineering	124	51	175	21%
Commerce and Industry	153	37	190	22%
Liberal Arts	91	53	144	17%
Nursing	23	5	28	3%
Sciences	60	25	85	10%
Forest and Recreation Resources	32	15	47	5%

MOST POPULAR SENDING INSTITUTIONS

Anderson College	73	17	90
Greenville Technical	61	27	88
Tri County Technical	41	19	60
USC - Columbia	16	18	34
College of Charleston	17	9	26
Francis Marion	15	4	19

PROPOSAL TO COUNCIL OF DEANS
Concerning Control of
Excessive Registration

Each student is limited to pre-register for no more than 19 hours each long semester. Students who require more than 19 hours may add during the drop/add period. Students who list more than 19 hours on their pre-registration form will receive a schedule of the first 19 or fewer hours (depending on course credit).

STATUS OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

- FS89-3-1 P SENATE REPORT ON PRIORITY LIST FOR FRINGE BENEFITS
The Welfare Committee presented a prioritized list of fringe benefit requests of the faculty. Based on a survey of the faculty, the list included changes to the state retirement plan along with increases in life insurance and tuition waivers for faculty dependents. The Provost and Administration have received the report.
- FS89-10-3 P RESOLUTION ON THE EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS
The Faculty Senate requests that each Department Head be evaluated by the Dean beginning with fifth year of his or her administrative service and continuing every third year thereafter. The Dean shall solicit the opinions of all permanent faculty and a representative of classified employees regarding areas of concern. The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head and the Provost. New Department Heads should receive an informal evaluation within the first two years of service. The Organization of Department Heads has expressed appreciation to the Senate for its efforts toward revising the current system used to evaluate department heads.
- FS89-12-2 P POLICY ON RESEARCH ETHICS
Definitions, policies, and procedures to address allegations of fraud or misconduct. The policy has been forwarded to the Provost.
- FS89-12-3 P RESOLUTION ON MOVING THE LAST DATE FOR STUDENTS TO DROP COURSES WITHOUT RECORD
The Faculty Senate recommends that the Administration move the first drop date to one day before the last day to add a class. The resolution has been forwarded to the Provost.

FS90-1-1 P

RESOLUTION ON PREROGATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY. Resolution reaffirms the prerogative of the President of Clemson University to oversee all University programs, including athletics. The President of the University expressed appreciation for the resolution.

February 6, 1990

**POLICY
on
RESEARCH ETHICS**

**Proposed Revisions
February 1990
FS90-2-3 P**

I. PREAMBLE

Research institutions have a critical responsibility to provide an environment that promotes integrity, while at the same time encouraging openness and creativity among scholars. Care must be taken to insure that honest error and ambiguities of interpretation of scholarly activities are distinguishable from outright misconduct. To address all allegations of fraud or misconduct, definition, policies, and procedures must be in place to facilitate and guide such processes.

II. DEFINITIONS

Research:

Research is used in a general sense (as opposed to scientific research) to yield a policy applicable to all academic disciplines in the university.

Misconduct:

The serious deviation from accepted practices in conducting research activities.

The substantial failure to comply with university, regulatory and funding agencies' requirements affecting specific aspects of the conduct of research.

This definition includes:

Falsification of data -- ranging from fabrication to deceptively selective reporting, including the purposeful omission of conflicting data with intent to falsify results;

Plagiarism -- representation of another's work as one's own;

Misappropriation of others' ideas -- the unauthorized use of privileged information (such as violation of confidentiality in peer review), however obtained.

Inquiry:

Expeditious gathering and review of information to determine if an investigation is warranted.

This is not a formal hearing, but a process designed to separate frivolous, unjustified or mistaken allegations from facts regarding the incident.

Investigation:

A formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if an instance of misconduct has occurred. If misconduct is confirmed, the investigation determines the seriousness of the offense and the extent of any adverse effects resulting from the misconduct.

Disposition:

Nature and severity of action taken as a result of an investigation of allegations. Actions can range from reprimand to termination of tenure and employment of the accused. If the investigation committee finds that the complaint was intentionally dishonest and malicious, the committee can recommend action against the accuser. In the event that allegations are not confirmed, the institution shall make full efforts to restore the reputation of the accused.

III. PROCEDURE

Overall Structure

An allegation or complaint involving the possibility of misconduct can be raised by anyone. The allegation should be made in writing to the Vice President for Research in a confidential manner. An inquiry, the first step of the review process, should result. In the inquiry state, factual information is gathered and expeditiously reviewed to determine if an investigation of the charge is warranted. An inquiry is not a formal hearing; it is designed to separate allegations deserving of further investigation from frivolous, unjustified or clearly mistaken allegation.

Inquiry

The Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate President will appoint a Committee of Inquiry of three faculty members with one individual appointed as Chair.

For any specific allegation or set of allegations, the Committee of Inquiry will determine if an investigation is warranted. The Committee of Inquiry will submit a written report to the Vice President for Research within 30 calendar days of receipt of the allegation.

Investigation

If the Committee of Inquiry so recommends, the Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate President will appoint within 20 calendar days a Committee of Investigation consisting of five faculty members to conduct a full investigation. Within the same 20 calendar days, the Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate President will notify the accused of the impending investigation and the nature of the allegations.

The Committee of Investigation, meeting in closed sessions, will review all materials, question relevant parties and allow for all parties to present their views separately (without the presence of the other parties) to the Committee.

The Committee of Investigation will forward a written recommendation for disposition within 90 calendar days through the Vice President for Research to the Provost.

The Provost will review the report and render a decision within 15 calendar days. Any recommendation from the Committee of Investigation that may constitute disciplinary action against a faculty member will be referred by the Provost to the appropriate dean, or other administrator as determined by the Provost. The dean or administrator will decide the appropriate action within 15 calendar days.

If disciplinary action taken against a faculty member constitutes a grievable action under either Faculty Grievance Procedure I or Faculty Grievance Procedure II, the faculty member may file a grievance in accordance with the appropriate procedure.

Guiding Principles

Maximize confidentiality and protect the reputations for both the accused and accuser during the full process.

Assure the respondent a fair hearing and access to reports.

Minimize the number of individuals involved in the inquiry and investigation phases.

Individuals chosen to assist in the inquiry process should have no real or apparent conflicts of interest bearing on the case in question. They should be unbiased, and have appropriate background for judging the issues being raised.

Consultation of university legal counsel is probably necessary.

Appropriate funding agencies should be fully informed in writing at both the outset and conclusion of an investigation.

All detailed documentation of the Committees of Inquiry and Investigation shall be maintained for at least three (3) years and must, upon request, be provided to authorized personnel.

Appropriate interim administrative actions will be taken at the outset to protect supporting funds and to insure that the purposes of the project are being met.

REPORT BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS
FS90-2-2 P

The purpose of Faculty Development Funds is to encourage and assist individual faculty members to become scholars.

For example, the funds are to be spent for the following:

- Professional memberships
- Subscriptions to professional journals
- Monographs appropriate for professional/scholarly activities
- Continuing education programs
- Other items or activities appropriate to the scholarship of individual faculty members.

The Faculty Development Funds are not to be used to increase the department's travel budget except with the approval of the individual faculty member.

The Faculty Development Funds are not to be used to enhance departmental collections or other department-wide activities except with the approval of the individual faculty member.

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

FS90-2-1 P

WHEREAS, The Faculty Development Funds of \$50.00 per faculty member are appreciated by the faculty;

WHEREAS, The Faculty Development Funds awarded in 1988-89 have increased the scholarly activity of those faculty receiving those funds;

WHEREAS, The faculty feel that \$50.00 per faculty member is not sufficient to fund membership in a professional society; and

WHEREAS, Block budgeting has not listed the Faculty Development Funds as a line item, leading some deans and department heads not to apply these funds for the purpose originally intended;

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate requests that Faculty Development Funds of \$150.00 per faculty member be listed as a line item in the budget of each college;

RESOLVED, That these funds be transmitted to each department as a line item in that department's budget; and

RESOLVED, That these funds of \$150.00 per faculty member be received by each faculty member to be applied toward membership in professional societies, purchase of scholarly journals or monographs appropriate to each faculty member's area of scholarship, or used for purchase of other items appropriate for increasing the scholarship of each faculty member exclusive of travel or the increasing of departmental collections or equipment except with the consent of the individual faculty member.

**Report Prepared by Faculty Senate Policy Committee
PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF DEANS
AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
February 1, 1990**

1. The Deans and the Director of the Libraries shall be evaluated every five years by the Provost who shall report the results to the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.
2. During the Dean's fifth year of administrative service, the Provost shall authorize the selection from the relevant college of one professor from each department who is not the department head, one department head, and one member of the Dean's classified staff which group shall direct the evaluation on behalf of their constituencies. The professors shall be elected by their departments, and the department head and the classified representative shall be selected by their colleagues.
3. The duties of the aforementioned evaluation group will be to elicit the separate views of every tenure-track faculty member, department head and permanent staff employee within the college on the following criteria as they relate to the Dean in the context of their own areas of concern:
 - a. The maintenance of faculty and staff relationships in general.
 - b. Support of the college and its needs within the University.
 - c. Enhancement of the outside visibility of the college.
 - d. Success in obtaining outside financial support and endowments.
 - e. The support of high teaching standards.
 - f. The encouragement and support of college research activities.
 - g. The support of the public service activities of the college.
 - h. Oversight of department heads with regard to their professional conduct and general effectiveness.
 - i. General support of faculty and staff professional activities within the college.
 - j. Adherence to university policies and procedures, including fiscal procedures and the faculty manual, and other policies outlined by the Provost and other appropriate authorities.
4. Findings shall be summarized separately by each member of the evaluating group and forwarded separately to the Provost in a timely manner.

College of Liberal Arts

OFFICE OF THE DEAN



February 9, 1990

TO: Faculty Senators Hallman Bryant, Ed Coulter, Paula Heusinkveld,
Peter Loge, John Ryan, and John Zanes

FROM: Robert A. Waller, Dean *R. A. Waller*

RE: Evaluation of Deans: A Personal Response

As you consider the agenda items for next Tuesday afternoon's meeting of the Faculty Senate, I offer these observations about the report from the Policy Committee on "Procedures for the Evaluation of Deans" (numbers refer to proposal features):

1. It seems to me that reporting the results to the Board of Trustees is a dimension whose time has not yet come. To my knowledge, the Board members here are not directly involved with evaluation of line officers at the level of a dean, nor should they be.
2. I suggest that the committee structure outlined has two undesirable consequences: a) it removes the provost from a direct fact-finding role since the committee screens all the input and b) it overlooks the contribution of those best in a position to make an informed judgment, i.e., all the department heads; any assistant/associate deans; five elected Faculty Advisory Council members in our case; and all members of the dean's classified staff.

From my perspective, the proposed committee could constitute yet another body from which the provost could solicit impressions. I would argue, however, that the sources mentioned above deserve to play a central role because of their working relationship with the candidate under review.

3. The generic approach to all the deans' responsibilities may require some adjustment vis-a-vis the special needs of individual colleges. Some environments require a keeper of the house, others a builder, and so on. I don't find fault with the areas of concern, but I do believe there'll be a need for some fine tuning. I also suggest that the group to be surveyed ("every tenure-track faculty member, department head and permanent staff employee," about 220 persons in our case) will reveal only impressionistic, not substantive, information on many of the concerns listed.

Faculty Senators
February 9, 1990
Page 2

4. Given the acceptance of the proposed committee structure, I do not understand why "each member of the evaluating group" needs to present a separate report to the provost. I should think there would be greater weight attached to a collective opinion based on the data gathered, with the option of a minority report if that were felt necessary.
5. Just as I want to be able to write a confidential letter to the provost about a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in our college and just as I wish to inform the candidate of my recommendation and the basis for it but not the detail, so too do I prefer that the provost be accorded the same privilege about me in conveying to the president my pluses and minuses. Once the summative decision has been made, then perhaps a formative one suggesting remedial actions may be appropriate. This is the practice I have followed with respect to the fifth-year review of department heads in our college. Only the President, not the Board, should receive the report.

I hope these observations and this perspective may prove helpful in responding to the committee's report when it is presented for consideration next Tuesday. Insofar as possible, what the Faculty Senate recommends for the deans should parallel what action you have already taken on the evaluation of department heads.

RAW/kz

cc: Provost David Maxwell
President Gordon Halfacre
Professor John Luedeman

College of Commerce and Industry

SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY



February 8, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor John Luedeman, Chairman
Faculty Senate Policies Committee

FROM: Jerry Trapnell, Chairman *Jerry Trapnell*
Executive Committee
Organization of Academic Department Heads

At its February 7, 1990, meeting, the Executive Committee of the OADH directed me to write you with some concerns about the proposed Faculty Senate resolution on the evaluation of deans. These concerns are as follows:

1. Under the current policies for the evaluation of deans, the Provost regularly consults with all department heads who report to the dean under review. The OADH feels strongly that his policy should continue. If the review committee has only one department head representative, a significant amount of input from those who work most closely with the dean may not be forthcoming to the committee and hence to the Provost. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the revised policy include the formal provision that all department heads who report to the dean under review should be consulted as part of the evaluation process. We suggest that your committee consider having a dual committee review similar to that used for faculty reappointment, promotion and tenure decision. One committee would be the department heads and one committee would be made up of faculty and classified staff.
2. A second concern is that the proposed policy makes no provision for peer review by other deans. We suggest that an important source of input on the effectiveness of a dean is the other deans with whom the individual has considerable contact and involvement. We hope this issue will be given some thought and discussed.
3. A third concern is with the dissemination of the results. As was the case with department heads, providing a summary report back to the college faculty is inconsistent with the results of evaluations of other personnel at the university. We feel that all personnel should be treated the same, administrators, faculty, and classified staff. Only those individuals in the chain of command should have access to the evaluation results. In the same way that faculty evaluations are not released to students, we do not feel that the evaluation reports on deans should not be released back to department heads and faculty.

The OADH respectfully submits these comments for your committee to consider. If you have questions, please give me a call.

cc: Gordon Halfacre ✓